

General Interim Guidelines for the Management of Investigative Waste

1. Addendum to General Interim Guidelines for the Management of Investigative Wastes (April 1, 2002)
2. Jan 14, 1993 Memo: General Interim Guidelines for the Management of Investigative Wastes
3. Attachment 1: Regulatory Requirements and Policies Affecting Investigative Waste (IW) management
4. Appendix A to Attachment 1: Excerpts from Omega Hills Approval
5. Appendix B to Attachment 1: EPA Publication 9345.3-03FS Facsimile: Guide to Management of Investigation-Derived Wastes
6. Attachment 2: Sampling and Testing of Investigative Wastes
7. Attachment 3: Long-Term On-Site Storage of Investigative Wastes (IW)

(this page intentionally blank)

Addendum to Publication RR-556
General Interim Guidelines for the Management of Investigative Waste
April, 2002

Chapter NR 718

Chapter NR 718, Wis. Adm. Code, has been promulgated since the development of this guidance. The provisions of that chapter may be applied to investigative waste soils.

Attachment 1 Statutory and Rule Cites

Some of the statutory and rule citations in attachment 1 to the guidance have changed since the guidance was issued. They're outlined below.

Solid Waste Statutes:

The solid waste statutes previously found in ch. 144, Wis. Stats. (ss. 144.43 to 144.47) are now found in ch. 289, Wis. Stats.

The definition of "solid waste" that was previously found in s. 144.01 (15), Wis. Stats., is now found in s. 289.01 (33), Wis. Stats.

Hazardous Waste Statutes:

The hazardous waste statutes previously found in ch. 144, Wis. Stats., (ss. 144.60 to 144.74) are now found in ch. 291, Wis. Stats.

Air Management Statutes:

The state statutes that provide the legal basis for the Air management program are now found in ch. 285, Wis. Stats.

Solid Waste, Hazardous Waste and Air Management Administrative Rules:

Solid waste program rules are found in the NR 500 rule series (chs. NR 500 to 590), hazardous waste program rules are found in the NR 600 rule series (chs. NR 600 to 690), and air management rules are found in the NR 400 rule series.

CORRESPONDENCE/MEMORANDUM

DATE: January 14, 1993

TO: District Solid and Hazardous Waste Program Supervisors and
Bureau Section Chiefs (SW, HW & ERR)

FROM: Paul Didier - SW/3

SUBJECT: General Interim Guidelines for the Management of Investigative Waste

FILE REF:

Contents

- I. Purpose
- II. Investigative Waste - Definition
- III. General Management Principles
 - A. General
 - B. Minimization
 - C. In-State/On-Site Policy
- D. Liquid IW
 - E. Management as Part of the Remedial Action
- IV. Complying With Requirements and Obtaining Approvals
 - A. Description of Requirements
 - B. Variances, Waivers and Enforcement Discretion
 - C. Responsibilities
- V. Specific Management Principles
 - A. Decontamination
 - B. Sampling, Testing and Short-Term Storage
 - C. Long-Term Storage
 - D. Test Pits
- VI. Working Group

Attachment 1 - Regulatory Requirements and Policies Affecting IW Management

Appendix A - Excerpts from Omega Hills Approval

Appendix B - EPA Superfund IW Factsheet

Attachment 2 - Guidelines for Sampling, Testing and Short-Term Storage

Attachment 3 - Guidelines for Long-Term Storage

I. Purpose

The purpose of this memo is to provide you with general interim guidelines for making decisions regarding the management of investigative waste (IW), produced at sites regulated by our various program authorities. The ERR program formed an investigative waste committee earlier, and some of the recommendations and materials they developed are considered in these guidelines and the attachments. It is my understanding that Mark Giesfeldt, Barb Zellmer and Lakshmi Sridharan will form a second workgroup, including District staff, to develop more specific

guidance on this topic, as needed. I would like the Districts to try to implement the guidelines for a 1 year period and then provide comments to this second workgroup. If you would like to provide comments before the workgroup is formed, please send them to Gary Edelstein - SW/3.

II. Investigative Waste - Definition

For the purposes of these guidelines, IW (or investigation-derived waste) is defined to include any solid waste, including any contaminated media (soil, rock or ground water) generated as a result of typical investigative activities. This includes, but is not limited to: drill cuttings from boring or monitoring well installations, decontamination fluids from cleaning investigative equipment (i.e., drill rigs, backhoes, sampling equipment such as bailers and pumps), spoils from backhoe pits, development water, purge water, water from pump tests, excess samples and dirty personal protective equipment and clothing intended to be thrown away. For purposes of these guidelines, IW does not include any wastes from activities generated as a result of remediation activities. Remediation wastes include wastes from petroleum tank/piping excavations, petroleum tank bottoms/sludges and other wastes that are picked up, treated and returned to the site. Also, the term does not include wastes used for treatability studies, including off-site bench scale tests and on-site pilot tests. We expect to develop separate guidelines in the future addressing the management of wastes generated as a result of remedial action, treatability and pilot test activities. Some of the principles outline in these guidelines may be found to be appropriate for those wastes.

III. General Management Principles

Whenever making decisions regarding the management of IW, the following general principles should be followed:

- A. **General** - IW management methods should be protective of human health and the environment and comply, to the extent practicable, with all applicable laws and rules, including wastewater, solid waste and hazardous waste laws and rules. As a general rule, it will be necessary to use best professional judgement, in light of the site specific conditions, to determine if a management option is protective of human health and the environment. In some instances, a variance, waiver or exemption may be available to allow certain on-site management methods, including redispersion of IW back on the site, that normally would not be allowed under the solid or hazardous waste laws and rules. In other instances, managers may make enforcement discretion decisions. This is discussed in more detail under the next section - Complying with Requirements and Obtaining Approvals.
- B. **Minimization** - The amount of IW produced should be minimized as much as possible. Work plans for investigations should outline drilling and sampling techniques that minimize the generation of IW. Non-intrusive investigation methods may be used, when such methods are considered appropriate for the site. The potential problems of managing IW should be a factor in choosing investigative methods. For additional specific suggestions for IW minimization methods, please refer to page 5 of the attached (appendix B) U.S. EPA Superfund fact sheet, under the title "IDW Minimization".
- C. **In-State/On-Site Policy** - Management of hazardous IW should be in accordance with our "Interim Policy for Promoting the In-State and On-Site Management of Hazardous Waste in Wisconsin", dated March 14, 1991.
- D. **Liquid IW** - Contaminated liquids should generally not be disposed of on the ground or back onto waste at a site. Aqueous wastes may be collected, properly characterized for possible treatment or incorporation into on-site remediation, such as for ground water or leachate, or collected for management at a permitted waste water treatment plant willing to accept these wastes, and having the appropriate approvals to do so. The preferred method for managing contaminated pump test discharges or other large volumes of aqueous wastes with low levels of contamination is to provide

any necessary treatment to meet Waste Water program requirements and discharge them to surface waters in accordance with those program requirements. It may be necessary to provide a temporary treatment unit for such discharges. Liquids generated from areas known to be free of contamination need not be handled as IW, but should not be disposed of over areas known to be contaminated or over waste, to avoid the leaching of additional contaminants into the environment.

E. Management as Part of Remedial Action - For sites where it is known that some sort of remedial action will be conducted in the future, secure on-site storage (see the long-term storage guidelines, attachment 3) and subsequent management of the IW through incorporation into the remedial action is preferred to off-site management, where possible. This will avoid the need for separate treatment and/or disposal arrangements. IW (with the exception of non-indigenous IW) generated during the course of an investigation can be considered part of the site and managed with other wastes from the site, consistent with a final remedy.

F. Field Screening - Where appropriate, field screening methods may be used to help determine if IW contains contaminants of concern, in lieu of laboratory testing. Staff project managers should decide if field screening is an appropriate method for making this determination on a site specific basis. In many instances, field screening might be used to help reduce the number of samples requiring laboratory analysis.

IV. Complying with Requirements and Obtaining Approvals

A. Description of Requirements - Attachment 1 describes the solid waste, hazardous waste, wastewater and air management requirements that may apply to IW. Whenever IW is produced, appropriate steps need to be taken to characterize the waste to determine whether it should be handled as a hazardous waste, and to determine the options available for both the short term and long term management of that IW.

B. Variances, Waivers and Enforcement Discretion - For activities requiring a hazardous waste license, it may be possible to obtain a variance from that licensing requirement. In addition, in an emergency situation a waiver from any of the hazardous waste requirements may be possible (limited to 90 days in duration). For activities requiring a solid waste license, a written exemption may be possible. **In other situations, a decision may be made to use discretion and not enforce certain solid and/or hazardous waste program requirements.** Each situation must be reviewed and considered individually regarding the appropriate course of action. The following criteria should be considered when making such decisions:

1. The contaminants, their concentrations, and total volume of IW;
2. Media potentially affected (e.g., groundwater, soil) under management options;
3. Location of nearest population(s) and the likelihood and/or degree of site access;
4. Potential exposure to workers; and
5. Potential for environmental impacts.

C. Responsibilities - If a project manager is assigned to and is actively overseeing a project, then that person is responsible for assuring that steps are taken to properly characterize the IW, that a plan is in place for the management of those wastes, and that appropriate approvals are obtained. In all cases I expect the District Program Supervisor to be responsible for determinations on whether, for

example, a license is required for a specific waste management activity, along with the other applicable requirements, and whether a variance, waiver or exemption from that licensing requirement is appropriate and possible, or whether discretion is proposed to be used to not enforce certain requirements. In cases where hazardous investigative wastes or large volumes of solid investigative wastes are to be managed or unusual or unique management principles are involved, the determination should be made in writing along with the basis for the determination.

V. Specific Management Principles

- A. **Decontamination** - Equipment decontamination should occur on a pad that is lined and designed to prevent surface water from running on to the pad and to prevent contaminated liquids from running off. Generally, these pads are sloped to drain to a sump that can be pumped out into a storage tank. Often, the pads are constructed of concrete with sealed joints or with a geomembrane covered with a geotextile and gravel. At many sites, it may be necessary to construct such a pad before the investigation begins. It may be necessary to decontaminate and/or manage as waste any contaminated material from the pad once it is decommissioned.
- B. **Sampling, Testing and Short-Term Storage** - Guidelines for sampling, testing and short-term storage of IW are outlined in attachment 2. Where appropriate, field screening methods may be used to help determine if IW contains contaminants of concern, in lieu of laboratory testing. ERR staff project managers should decide if field screening is an appropriate method for making this determination on a site-specific basis.
- C. **Long-term Storage** - Guidelines for long-term storage are outlined in attachment 3. For hazardous IW, a storage facility license may be required for long-term storage.
- D. **Test Pits** - Test pit spoils returned to the same excavation immediately (generally on the same day), where returning the spoils does not pose an increased threat to human health or the environment has been allowed in the past without meeting all approval/licensing requirements using enforcement discretion, and this should be allowed to continue.

VI. Working Group

I expect that the working group formed to develop the specific guidance on this issue will provide direction for which circumstances it is appropriate to use the various authorities to approve the management of investigative waste, and that guidance will provide the direction staff need to assure that we are being consistent state wide on this issue. I also anticipate that this group will develop the specific procedures to use in making decisions regarding the management of investigative waste.

I hope that the working group can be formed and develop the specific guidance on this topic in the next several months. In the mean time please use the general guidelines I have laid out in this memo, as you and your staff address IW management issues.

Attachs.

GAE:BJZ:MFG

cc: Solid & Hazardous Waste Program Unit Leaders, District & Central Office
Darsi Foss - SW/3
Linda Meyer, Patti Hanz, Deb Johnson, & Pete Flaherty - LC/5

ATTACHMENT 1

REGULATORY REQUIREMENTS AND POLICIES AFFECTING INVESTIGATIVE WASTE (IW) MANAGEMENT

Solid Waste Program, Ch. 144, Stats. and Chs. NR 500-520, Wis. Adm. Code

The Solid Waste Program has no regulations or guidance aimed specifically at IW. Under that program's rules and statutes, any material or media from an investigation, even if it is uncontaminated, that is generated and is to be discarded is a solid waste, because the statutory definition of solid waste (s. 144.01(15), Stats.) is very broad. The definition of disposal is also very broad and includes the replacement of solid waste in a closed landfill or other site under investigation. Chapters NR 500-520, Wis. Adm. Code, require persons to obtain a license and meet operating and design standards in order to dispose of solid waste. However, there are exemptions in the rule for the disposal of clean media in s. NR 500.08, Wis. Adm. Code, and wastewater facilities for liquid wastes are also exempt from the rule. Therefore, under the statute and rules, any on-site management of IW consisting of contaminated media or any other material must be in a licensed solid waste facility that meets all operating and design standards or, for liquid wastes, in an exempt wastewater facility. Therefore, re-disposal of such wastes in a closed landfill or disposal area is not allowed without meeting standards and obtaining a license. However, the engineering unit leaders in the program have indicated that there is no site they're aware of where excavated waste from a solid (non-hazardous) waste landfill wasn't allowed to be redispersed. The program does have a policy (no specific policy memo, although letters and plan approvals may have mentioned it) concerning the re-disposal of solid waste at closed, covered sites. The program will generally allow waste within the site to be moved around on the site, within licensed acreage, for the purposes of grading for site drainage or cover improvement, provided the total waste volume (called design capacity) is not exceeded. Written exemptions from any program requirement, including licensing, may be granted if a written application is submitted and the applicant can show the activity will not cause environmental pollution.

State Hazardous Waste Program, S. 144.60-144.64, Stats. and Chs. NR 600-685, Wis. Adm. Code

The Hazardous Waste Program has no regulations aimed specifically at IW. The only policy memo relating to them is a 4/28/89 memo from Barb Zellmer to the District SW Coordinators specifying who makes determinations on whether a remedial action waste is hazardous. Again, there is a policy on the re-disposal of waste. This policy was documented in the September 29, 1989 closure and long-term plan approval for the Omega Hills North Landfill (appendix A). In summary, the policy generally prohibits the re-disposal of hazardous waste in closed facilities, however, the Program can review such re-disposal proposals on case-by-case basis for each remedial action or investigation proposal, accounting for the latest U. S. EPA guidance (see Superfund, below for the U. S. EPA guidance and regulations discussion).

Although not specifically aimed at IW, the Program has some important requirements that affect its management:

-The definitions of hazardous waste (HW) and solid waste. The IW must be a solid waste to be a HW. The definition of solid waste comes from the solid waste program statutes (s. 144.01(15), Stats.), so any material from an investigation is a solid waste. How a solid waste is identified as hazardous is complicated, but there is considerable guidance available on the subject from both the Program and U. S. EPA. For quick reference, one of the better guidelines is the Superfund Program's land disposal restriction (LDR) fact sheet #5. This discusses how a HW determination is made for waste managed in sites before the HW regulations took effect. There are some exceptions, but for the most part, the state HW rules identify HW the same way the federal rules do. The most notable exceptions are the state F027 and F500 waste listings and the federal TCLP rule, discussed in the next section. The F027 listing is broader than U. S. EPA's, the F500 listing only exists in the state rules and the state rules do not yet have the TCLP test.

-Generator requirements apply to IW that is hazardous. An EPA ID number must be obtained, the manifest system used and the waste must be managed at an approved HW facility. Licensed HW transporters must haul any waste if taken off-site. On-site temporary tank and container storage standards apply to waste as it is generated. Generators who fall under small quantity generator categories must comply with rules less extensive than large quantity generators (it is expected that at most remedial action sites, the amount of IW waste generated would exceed the small quantity generator amounts of 100 and 1000 kg. generated per month).

-Licensing and facility operating and design standards apply to units where HW is treated, stored or disposed of. Large quantity generators must utilize a licensed storage facility for wastes held for more than 90 days. Under a strict interpretation of the rules, any on-site management of hazardous IW (if the quantity is over 100 kg. per month) must be in a licensed HW facility that meets all operating and design standards (under certain circumstances, wastes from generators who produce <100 kg. per month may also be disposed of at a solid waste landfill approved for such disposal by the Department). Therefore, under this interpretation, re-disposal of such wastes in a closed landfill or disposal area is not allowed. Exemptions from the facility design and operating standards (but not licensing) are allowed if the applicant can show equivalent protection. Variances from licensing are allowed for up to 5 years if a hardship to any person exists, and an application is submitted showing how the facility design and operating standards will be met. The variance section has been revised, as part of the NR 600 renumbering revisions, to allow certain types of land disposal. Waivers from any requirement may be granted if an emergency condition exists. As part of the recent revisions, the waiver provision is being expanded to allow waivers for HW management as part of an immediate response to a discharge.

Federal Hazardous Waste Program

Wisconsin is authorized to implement the HW program in lieu of U. S. EPA. However, there are 2 aspects of the federal program that affect IW management that are not yet part of Wisconsin's program. These are the LDR's and the TCLP characteristic.

The LDR's apply to HW that is land disposed. Usually, the waste must be treated before disposal occurs. The requirements are complex, but guidance is available. For quick reference, the Superfund LDR fact sheet series is recommended. Again, under a strict interpretation, re-disposal of IW on-site would trigger the LDR restrictions. There is no LDR guidance that specifically addresses IW. U. S. EPA may grant several types of variances from the LDR's. For Superfund soil and debris, a treatability variance will normally be granted if a remedy is selected that will not meet LDR treatment levels. However, even under the variance, a certain level of treatment would still be required.

The recently promulgated TCLP test brings many more solid wastes into the HW program. The leach procedure allows wastes that contain certain organics to become characteristic HW, based on the amount of organics that leach out of the waste under the test. Certain contaminated media from the federal underground storage tank program are temporarily excluded. Many IW's that would not be listed HW under the rules are now hazardous under TCLP. There is no TCLP guidance that specifically addresses IW.

Federal Superfund Program

The Superfund Program has no regulations specifically addressing the procedures for managing IW. However, this program has developed general policies on the issue. There is discussion in the proposed (53 FR 51442, 12/21/88) and final (55 FR 8755, 3/8/90) National Contingency NCP preambles on the program's policies for IW. There is a statement that all state and federal standards (applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements - ARARs) should be met for IW management, but for on-site management, "best management practices" are the rule, and compliance is only required to "the extent practicable". U. S. EPA's position is that all investigations (apparently including preresidential site inspections) are conducted pursuant to the CERCLA removal authority, and strict compliance with all standards is not required for a removal (It is important to note that Wisconsin has no equivalent authority under

any of the response programs.). Under the federal policy, if IW is managed off-site, however, the facility must be approved for the waste, and in compliance with the Superfund off-site facility policy.

IW managed as part of a Superfund remedial action entirely on-site fall under the on-site permit exemption in §121(e) of CERCLA. Such actions must comply with the substantive technical requirements that are applicable or relevant and appropriate to a management method, but no federal, state or local approvals, permits or licenses are required for the on-site action.

The proposed NCP discussion gives only 2 extreme examples of how to manage IW. The first is that if the IW is from an area with significant dioxin contamination, it will be containerized, tested and managed in accordance with all ARARs. It then mentions that it is standard practice to leave IW on-site until the remedial action commences. The second example is offered as a contrast to the first, stating that the routine testing and containerization of large volumes of drilling muds and purge waters not suspected to contain hazardous substances may be unnecessary.

In January, 1992, the Superfund Program issued a quick reference fact sheet that apparently only applies to the remedial program (copy attached).

The federal preresidential program has developed a more extensive draft guidance manual addressing IW management. The draft manual has information on regulatory requirements, identification of the specific types of IW, and specific guidelines on how to manage the waste in specific situations. It is generally written to allow flexibility for investigators, consistent with the NCP preamble policies discussed above. Most importantly, it states that:

-Non-hazardous IW, including liquids, may be re-disposed of on-site, regardless of its hazard or the concentration of hazardous constituents in the waste.

-Hazardous IW may be re-disposed of on-site if it poses no immediate threat to human health and the environment, considering the potential for community relations problems with residents in the area. Hazardous organic decontamination fluids may be evaporated (small amounts), or should be disposed of off-site.

Wastewater Program

Liquid IW that is to be discharged to a surface water or sewage treatment plant (POTW) must meet this program's requirements. It should be noted that such discharges are, for the most part, exempt from regulation under the solid or hazardous waste programs.

For surface water discharges, the Wastewater program normally requires a WPDES permit be obtained and specific discharge standards be met, including standards for toxics. It is possible, following future revisions to the Department's general permit that fluids containing very low concentrations of regulated substances may be discharged without treatment or a specific permit. If the concentrations of these substances are above levels of concern, treatment will be required under the general permit, or under a specific permit for more long-term or high volume discharges, such as certain pump tests. However, a short form application for discharge is required. Any person may be issued a general permit if its requirements are met. The program has allowed "on-site" wastewater discharges that are part of a federal Superfund site remedial action to only meet the substantive requirements of a permit, and has not required specific permits for those discharges.

For POTW discharge, the state requirements are usually minimal for these types of wastes. Ch. NR 211, Wis. Adm. Code, prohibits discharges that interfere with or pass through a POTW as well as discharges that exhibit certain characteristics, i. e., explosive, corrosive, fire hazard or could cause a sewer blockage. However, the local authority that operates the facility must give permission for the discharge, and will impose pretreatment requirements, which can vary, depending on the local pretreatment ordinance, and the potential for the discharge to interfere with the

POTW's operation. The local pretreatment requirements can include specific numeric limits for specific contaminants.

Air Management Program

Very briefly, this program regulates air emissions above certain amounts. In some cases it may be advantageous to evaporate certain IW's, such as organic decontamination liquids. This may be done without controls if the emissions do not exceed certain amounts.

Appendix A
Excerpts from Omega Hills Approval

September 29, 1989

IN REPLY REFER TO: 4430

Mr. Kevin O'Toole
District Manager
Waste Management of Wisconsin, Inc.
Two Park Plaza
10850 West Park Place, Suite 1200
Milwaukee, WI 53224

SUBJECT: Conditional Approval (Modification) of the
Chapter NR 181 Closure and Long-Term Care Plan
Omega Hills North Landfill
EPA ID# WID000808568

REVIEW COMMENTS

Management of Newly Generated Waste after Covering and Facility Decontamination

Since the landfill is defined as one unit, and there are no effective barriers we are aware of to prevent hazardous constituent migration, any waste, removed from the landfill as a result of any construction, remediation or investigation must be managed as a listed hazardous waste at an on or off-site facility that is licensed, permitted or approved to accept such hazardous wastes. This is because such waste or material is a mixture of solid and hazardous waste and/or is derived from the previous disposal of listed hazardous waste (see s. NR 181.12(1)(b)2. and 4., Wis. Adm. Code). Therefore, there are no "documented non-hazardous waste areas" which would contain non-hazardous wastes we are aware of.

In view of the above discussion, any remedial or other construction work at this site will likely contaminate the equipment used for construction with hazardous constituents. Therefore, all such equipment must be subject to an approved decontamination procedure that must be developed now. The closure plan indicates such a procedure will only be developed if needed at a later date. Therefore, the determination contains a condition requiring WMI to develop and submit that procedure for approval within 30 days.

RESPONSE TO COMMENTS

On September 13, 1989, WMI submitted, through its attorneys, comments on the Departments August 14, 1989 draft determination, along with other legal documents that requested various actions by the Department. The legal

documents will be responded to under separate cover. A meeting was held on September 14, 1989 to discuss certain technical issues related to the draft determination. WMI submitted additional comments related to the statistical test used for groundwater monitoring on September 14, 1989, through its attorneys. WMI submitted additional comments on the final use plan issue and a copy of an August 13, 1976 soil documentation report prepared by STS Engineers, Inc. on September 19, 1989. WMI submitted information on a site in Pennsylvania on September 26, 1989. Department staff had additional conversations with WMI staff regarding statistical analysis issues on September 28, 1989. The Department's response to all the comments, submittals (except the legal documents) and the meeting are outlined below.

Condition No. 4

This condition sets out the requirements relating to the re-disposal of wastes in the landfill that are generated from on-site remedial actions and investigations, herein referred to as the "re-disposal issue." This issue involves both Department and U. S. EPA regulations and policies. U. S. EPA's policies relating to this issue are still evolving. To give a clear response to the comments, it is helpful to briefly describe both the Department's and U.S. EPA's regulations and policies.

Under s. NR 181.44(1), Wis. Adm. Code, a landfill may not operate (i. e. accept hazardous waste for disposal) without having an operating or interim license or waiver issued under ch. NR 181, Wis. Adm. Code (variances aren't available to landfills under s. NR 181.55(10), Wis. Adm. Code). In accordance with the Chapter, hazardous waste can be generated from on-site remedial or investigative activities at the landfill. Under the "derived-from" and "mixture" rules, s. NR 181.12(1)(b)4. and 2., Wis. Adm. Code, material removed from the landfill, once removed for management, are hazardous wastes if they are contaminated by hazardous constituents from the past disposal of listed hazardous wastes. A closed landfill which doesn't have an operating or interim license may not accept such material for disposal, even if the material originated there, without violating the rule. The Department has, as a matter of policy, allowed closing landfills that formerly accepted hazardous waste (the Department may allow a closing hazardous waste landfill to continue to operate and accept solid waste under s. NR 181.44(12)(a), Wis. Adm. Code) and still have open hazardous waste units to continue to accept remedial waste generated on-site without a license or waiver, but only until the open hazardous waste unit closes.

U.S. EPA's regulations are similar and require a landfill to have a permit or interim status to continue to accept hazardous waste, and also require a landfill to close within 180 days after ceasing to accept hazardous waste (U.S. EPA is proposing regulations that would allow disposal facilities to continue to accept non-hazardous solid wastes without closing). It's regulations also include the "derived-from" and "mixture" rules. In addition, U. S. EPA has developed a "contained In" policy for non-solid waste media, such as soil or groundwater that is contaminated by hazardous wastes. Such contaminated media must be managed as a hazardous waste until all the contamination is removed, if contaminated by listed waste, or until the contaminated media no longer displays a characteristic, if contaminated by characteristic waste. U. S. EPA has been petitioned to develop a "deminimus"

rule setting specific concentration levels for hazardous constituents in media below which it would no longer be regulated as a hazardous waste. Until such a rule is promulgated, U. S. EPA and the states may look at each situation involving potentially contaminated media on a case by case basis.

U. S. EPA has developed additional policy and guidance related to the application of the HSWA land disposal restrictions for on-site actions at sites remediated under a federal Superfund project. The Department understands that U. S. EPA intends that this policy apply to RCRA hazardous waste facilities. WMI's comments referred to some of this guidance, as related to Superfund sites. In summary, this guidance describes how to determine when a RCRA waste is being managed and when a disposal activity takes place on-site that triggers the land disposal restrictions. A new term, "placement", was developed to help determine when disposal occurs that cause the land disposal restrictions to apply. This term does not appear in the federal regulations. However, the Department understands that U. S. EPA plans to codify the policy in the future. In short, "placement", and hence disposal, takes place if waste is managed in a different unit than it came from, or in the same unit it came from if it is first managed in an intervening treatment or storage unit. If the waste is moved around or consolidated in the same unit or "area of contamination", consolidated without being managed in an intervening unit, then "placement" does not occur.

The Department has not yet incorporated the land disposal prohibitions into ch. NR 181, Wis. Adm. Code, but intends to do so in the future. Once those rules are adopted, the Department will consider adopting the U. S. EPA policies and guidance related to them. In the meantime, the Department can consider, on a case by case basis, U. S. EPA's policies when formulating its own policies on the re-disposal issue.

WMI has requested that the Department regulate wastes removed from the landfill differently. Specifically, WMI has requested that:

1. Material removed from the landfill that has "clearly been significantly contaminated by demonstrable mixing and are removed for placement at a different management unit..." would be the only material managed as a hazardous waste in accordance with the condition.
2. The Department grant a treatability variance for soil and debris from the landfill and allow removed waste to be replaced in the existing fill or disposed of at Parkview Landfill.
3. That leachate from the landfill be assigned the hazardous waste number for all the hazardous wastes known to be accepted at the landfill.

In response to request 1, limiting the requirements to material that has "clearly been significantly contaminated by demonstrable mixing" would not meet the intent of the "derived-from" and "mixture" rules under ch. NR 181, Wis. Adm. Code. In addition, such a limit would be contrary to U. S. EPA's regulations; we are not aware of any federal policy that limits these two rules as this proposed language would. Finally, it is not clear who would make such a demonstration. Any material from the landfill that has the potential to be contaminated by hazardous constituents must be managed as a hazardous waste. However, in response to the submitted comments and the

September 14 meeting discussion, the Department can further refine the condition to more clearly indicate that if soil, including cover soil, and groundwater is demonstrated by WMI to not be contaminated, then it would not be regulated as a hazardous waste in accordance with the condition. This was the condition's original intent. Until a "deminimus" rule is in place, the Department has latitude in judging if a demonstration method is adequate. Generally, the Department's policy is to require testing of the material, and field screening methods can be considered, depending on the hazardous constituents of concern (i. e., if VOC's are of concern, an Hnu or OVA screening method may be appropriate). Also, Department field staff may determine, on a case by case basis, that certain materials are not considered contaminated based on field observations.

Request 1 also has language further limiting the requirements only to material "removed for placement in a different management unit". This limitation would defeat the purpose of the condition and would generally allow re-disposal on site without limits. This would be in clear violation of ch. NR 181, Wis. Adm. Code, as outlined in the second paragraph of the response to the Condition No. 4 comments, above. We also note this would be in conflict with the Closure and Long-Term Care plan, page 2-10. The Department does not intend to grant a "blanket" approval to the re-disposal of waste in the landfill during the entire long-term care period. Therefore, the condition will not be revised to conform with this request. However, in light of U. S. EPA's policies, as discussed above, the Department is willing to consider, on a case by case basis, requests for re-disposal of wastes associated with remedial actions and investigations, with each separate remedial action or investigation proposal. That will allow the Department to take into account any changes in U. S. EPA guidance or policy, the kinds of wastes being generated, any testing requirements, and the portion of the landfill the wastes are being re-disposed of in. The Department will not approve such proposals unless they conform with any U. S. EPA guidance, policy or regulations in effect at the time.

Request 2 refers to a variance authority under the HSWA land disposal prohibitions, which are not contained in ch. NR 181, Wis. Adm. Code at this time. Therefore, the Department does not have the authority to consider such a variance, so the condition can't be changed in response. In addition, it is not clear that U. S. EPA will grant this variance authority to a state as part of the authorization process.

Request 3 refers to a letter regarding a leachate pretreatment pilot facility that has since closed at the landfill. The Department has no objection to the suggested waste code designation. The proper procedure to formally notify the Department and U. S. EPA of a waste code designation is through specific correspondence and a revised notification form. However, it should be noted that if such material (or any other material from the site covered by this condition) is manifested, a specific waste code or code(s) will be needed on the manifest form. Questions on this issue should be directed to the Department's Southeast district hazardous waste staff. No revision to the determination appears to be necessary to respond to the request.

BEFORE THE
STATE OF WISCONSIN
DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES

CONDITIONAL CLOSURE AND
LONG-TERM CARE PLAN APPROVAL (MODIFICATION)
OMEGA HILLS NORTH LANDFILL
EPA ID# WID000808568

CONDITIONAL CLOSURE AND LONG-TERM CARE PLAN
APPROVAL (MODIFICATION)

The Department hereby approves the Closure and Long-Term Care Plan for the landfill, subject to the following conditions which hereby modify the plan:

4. All wastes, liquids, contaminated groundwater, contaminated soils or other materials removed from the landfill as a result of any construction, remediation or investigation shall be managed as a hazardous waste at a facility licensed, permitted or approved to accept such wastes, in accordance with s. NR 181.21(4), Wis. Adm. Code, regardless of where the material originates. The Department shall consider specific requests by WMI, on a case by case basis, on whether soil or groundwater to be removed from the landfill is contaminated and therefore subject to this condition. The Department shall consider specific requests by WMI, on a case by case basis, on whether material removed as part of a particular remedial action or investigation may be managed in a different fashion than set out in this condition, but only when such requests accompany the particular remedial action or investigation proposal.

EPA-	<p>Publication: 9345.3-O3FS April 1992</p> <p>United States Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Solid Waste and Emergency Response</p> <p>Office of Emergency and Remedial Response Hazardous Site Control Division OS-220W Quick Reference Fact Sheet</p>
------	---

Guide to Management of investigation—Derived Wastes

CERCLA field investigation activities (e.g., remedial investigation/feasibility studies and remedial designs) may result in the generation of waste materials that may pose a risk to human health and the environment. These investigation-derived wastes (IDW) may include drilling muds, cuttings, and purge water from test pit and well installation; purge water, soil, and other materials from collection of samples; residues (e.g., ash, spent carbon, well development purge water) from testing of treatment technologies and pump and treat systems; contaminated personal protective equipment (PPE); and solutions (aqueous or otherwise) used to decontaminate non-disposable protective clothing and equipment. The management of IDW must ensure protection of human health and the environment and comply with (or waive) regulatory requirements that are applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements (ARAR). **This fact sheet presents an overview of possible IDW management options, discusses the protectiveness requirements and ARARs associated with these options, and outlines general objectives established for IDW management under Superfund.**

The general options for managing IDW (see Highlight 1) are collection and either (1) immediate disposal or (2) some type of interim management. Interim management may include storage or other temporary measures. As discussed below, the specific option selected will depend on the type of waste produced, its relative threat to human health and the environment, and other site-specific conditions.

IDW MANAGEMENT REQUIREMENTS

When managing IDW, site managers are required to choose an option that: (1) is protective of human health and the environment and (2) complies with (or waives) ARARs, as described below.

Protectiveness

In determining if a particular management/disposal option is protective, site managers should consider the following:

- The contaminants, their concentrations, and total volume of IDW;
- Media potentially affected (e.g., ground water, soil) under management options;
- Location of the nearest population(s) and the likelihood and/or degree of site access;
- Potential exposures to workers; and
- Potential for environmental impacts.

¹ Management of treatability study and treatment pilot wastes is discussed in Guide for Conducting Treatability Studies Under CERCLA, Interim Final, December 1989, EPA/540/2-89/058. Information on management of IDW generated during Preliminary Assessments and Site Investigations is provided in Management of Investigation-Derived Waste During Site Investigations, May 1990, EPA/540/G-91/009.

As a general rule, it will be necessary to use best professional judgment, in light of the site-specific conditions, to determine whether an option is protective of human health and the environment. For example, a site manager may determine that storing IDW temporarily until the final action or returning IDW to its source is protective, based on knowledge that the material **poses** low risk and/or that the final action will address any risks posed by the wastes and there will be no unacceptable risks in the interim.

Alternatively, if the site includes or is near residential areas, the site is unsecured, and/or contaminants appear to be present at unacceptable levels, it may not be protective to return excavated soil to the source. Storing IDW in containers in an on-site, secure location, or sending it off site immediately may be more appropriate.

Site managers also need to consider the potential effects of IDW management-related activities on environmental media. For example, pouring contaminated purge water on the ground around a well may not be prudent, because such an action could mobilize any hazardous constituents present in the soil or introduce contaminants into clean soil.

Compliance with ARARs

Remedial Investigation/Feasibility Study (RI/FS) and Remedial Design (RD) actions must comply with ARARs “to the extent practicable, considering the exigencies of the situation” (NCP, 55 FR 8756, emphasis added); therefore, it generally will not be necessary to obtain a waiver if an ARAR cannot be attained during these actions. If a site manager determines that, based on site-

Highlight 1: IDW Management Options

<u>Type of IDW</u>	<u>Generation Processes</u>	<u>Management Options</u>
Soil	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well/test pit installation Borehole drilling Soil sampling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Return to boring, pit, or source immediately after generation Spread around boring pit, or source within the AOC+ Consolidate in a pit (within the AOC) Send to on-site TDU+ Send to TDU off site immediately Store for future treatment and/or disposal
Sludges/sediment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sludge pit/sediment sampling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Return to boring pit, or source immediately after generation Send to on-site TDU Send to TDU off site immediately Store for future treatment and/or disposal
Aqueous liquids (ground water, surface water, drilling fluids, other wastewaters)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Well installation/development Well purging during sampling Ground water discharge during pump tests Surface water sampling 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Discharge to surface water Pour onto ground close to well (non-hazardous waste) Send to on-site TDU Send to off-site commercial treatment unit Send to POTW+ Store for future treatment and/or disposal
Decontamination fluids	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Decontamination of PPE+ and equipment 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Send to on-site TDU Evaporate (for small amounts of low contamination organic fluids) Send to TDU off site immediately Store for future treatment and/or disposal
Disposable PPE	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sampling procedures or other on-site activities 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Send to on-site TDU Place in on-site industrial dumpster Send to TDU off site immediately Store for future treatment and/or disposal

*The generation processes listed here are provided as examples. IDW may also be produced as a result of activities not listed here. +AOC: Area of Contamination (AOCs at a site may not yet have been identified at the time of the RI/FS); TDU: Treatment/disposal Unit; POTW: Publicly Owned Treatment Works; PPE Personal Protective Equipment

specific factors, compliance with an ARAR is practicable but an ARAR waiver is warranted for an RI/FS or RD action, an interim action waiver may be available if the final remedy will attain the ARAR. An action memorandum should be prepared for the waiver, the state given an opportunity to comment, and the decision document placed in the administrative record.

Potential ARARs for IDW at CERCLA sites include regulations under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA) (including both Federal and State underground injection control (UIC) regulations), the Clean Water Act (CWA), the Clean Air Act (CAA), the Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA), and other State environmental laws. How these various requirements may direct or influence IDW management decisions is described below.

Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). Certain sections of the RCRA Subtitle C hazardous waste regulations (e.g., land disposal restrictions and storage restrictions) may be ARARs for IDW should RCRA hazardous waste be identified at a site. (Note that RCRA may be relevant and appropriate even if the IDW is not a RCRA hazardous waste.) A waste is hazardous under RCRA if it is listed as such in 40 CFR 261.31 - 261.33 or if it exhibits one of four characteristics: ignitability, corrosivity, reactivity, or toxicity.

Site managers should not assume that a waste considered to pose a potential risk at a CERCLA site is a listed or characteristic RCRA hazardous waste. Until there is positive evidence (records, test results, other knowledge of waste properties) that the IDW is a RCRA hazardous waste, site managers should manage it in a protective manner (but not necessarily in accordance with Subtitle C requirements). Business records or facility processes should be examined to determine whether RCRA listed wastes were generated and are present in the IDW. For characteristic wastes, site managers should rely on testing results or on knowledge of the material's properties. If best professional judgment and available information indicate that, for protectiveness reasons (or because RCRA requirements are relevant and appropriate), IDW is best managed as a "hazardous waste," management in accordance with Subtitle C requirements is prudent, regardless of whether it is known to be a RCRA waste.

If aqueous liquid IDW is considered a RCRA hazardous waste, the site manager should determine whether the Domestic Sewage Exclusion (DSE) applies to the discharge of that IDW to a POTW. The RCRA DSE exempts domestic sewage and any mixture of domestic sewage and other wastes that passes through a sewer system to a POTW for treatment from classification as a solid waste and, therefore, as a RCRA hazardous waste (40 CFR 261.4).

- Land Disposal Restrictions

If IDW is determined to be a RCRA hazardous waste and subject to the land disposal restrictions (LDRs), "land disposal" of the IDW will be prohibited unless specified treatment standards are met (see Superfund LDR Guides #5 and #7, Determining When LDRs Are Applicable to CERCLA Response Actions and Determining When LDRs Are Relevant and Appropriate to CERCLA Response Actions OSWER Directive 93473.05FS and 9347.3-08FS, June 1989 and December 1989 and the NCP, 55 FR 8759, March 8, 1990). "Land disposal" occurs when wastes from different AOCs are consolidated into one AOC; when wastes are moved outside an AOC (for treatment or storage) and returned to the same or a different AOC; or when wastes are excavated, placed in a separate hazardous waste management unit such as an incinerator or tank within the AOC, and then redeposited into the AOC.

Storing IDW in a container ("a portable device in which a material is stored, transported, treated, disposed of, or otherwise handled" (40 CFR 260.10)) within the AOC and then returning it to its source, however, is allowable without meeting the specified LDR treatment standards. Under the definition of "hazardous waste management unit" (40 CFR 260.10), EPA states that "a container alone does not constitute a unit; the unit includes the containers and the land or pad upon which they are placed." Therefore, returning IDW that has been stored in containers (not tanks or other RCRA-regulated units) within the AOC to its source does not constitute land disposal, as long as containers are not managed in such a manner as to constitute a RCRA storage unit as defined in 40 CFR 260.10. In addition, sampling and direct replacement of wastes within an AOC do not constitute land disposal.

- Storage

Subtitle C outlines the storage requirements for RCRA hazardous wastes. Under RCRA, "storage" is defined as "the holding of hazardous waste for a temporary period, at the end of which the hazardous waste is treated, disposed of, or stored elsewhere" (40 CFR 260.10).

On-site Superfund actions are only required to comply with the substantive standards of other laws (see 40 CFR 300.5, definitions of applicable or relevant and appropriate requirements). Superfund sites are also exempt from permit requirements under CERCLA §121(e). Therefore, site managers are not required to comply with administrative requirements triggered by RCRA storage deadlines (e.g., contingency planning, inspections, recordkeeping). Generally equivalent administrative activities are undertaken at Superfund sites, however, under existing Superfund management practices.

Site managers storing known RCRA hazardous waste must comply with the substantive, technical requirements of 40 CFR Parts 264 and 265 Subparts I (containers), J (tanks), and L (waste piles), to the extent practicable. (See Highlight 2 for a summary of these technical requirements for each type of unit). In addition, the ground-water monitoring requirements of 40 CFR Parts 264 and 265 Subpart F are potential ARARs, and to the extent they are determined to be ARARs at a site, they should be attained to the extent practicable (or waived). (In many cases, ground-water monitoring conducted during the RI/FS will provide protection equivalent to the Subpart F requirements.)

[NOTE: Under the LDRs, restricted RCRA hazardous waste may not be stored at a site unless the storage is solely for the purpose of accumulating sufficient quantities of the waste to facilitate proper disposal, treatment, or recovery (see 40 CFR 268.50). Generally, storing IDW until a final disposal option is selected in a Record of Decision (ROD) and Implemented during the remedial action is allowable storage under the RCRA LDR storage prohibition.]

- Recordkeeping and Manifesting

If hazardous wastes are sent off site, the site manager must comply with both administrative and substantive elements of the RCRA generator requirements of 40 CFR Part 262 and LDR notification and certification requirements of Part 268. (For example, a site manager must prepare an LDR notification and certification when restricted wastes are sent off site to a land disposal facility.) These standards include requirements such as manifests for shipping waste that list all hazardous waste listing and characteristics applicable to the waste (see 40 CFR 262.11), packaging and transport requirements, and recordkeeping requirements.

If the LDRs are applicable, the following information should be collected and available before the removal of wastes to an off-site disposal facility: EPA hazardous waste number, LDR treatment standards, manifest number for the waste shipment, and waste analysis data.

Highlight 2:

Examples of RCRA Technical Storage Requirements

RCRA storage requirements, applicable to both less-than-90-days generators and permitted or interim status storage facilities, may include the following substantive requirements:

Containers 40 CFR 264 Subpart I and 265 Subpart I

- Containers must be in good condition
- Wastes must be compatible with containers
- Container must be closed during storage
- Container storage areas must have a containment system that can contain 10 percent of the volume of containers or of the largest container
- Spilled or leaked waste must be removed from the collection area as necessary to prevent overflow

Tanks 40 CFR 264 Subpart J and 265 Subpart J

- Tanks must have a secondary containment system that includes a liner, a vault, a double-walled tank, or an equivalent device (applies only to certain tanks)

Waste Piles 40 CFR 264 Subpart L and 265 Subpart L

- Waste piles must have a liner and a leachate collection and removal system
- Owners/operators must have a run-on control system to prevent flow on to the active portion of the pile during peak discharge from at least 25 year storm
- Owners/operators must have a run-off management system to collect and control at least the water volume resulting from a 24-hour, 25-year storm
- This is a partial list of substantive requirements. For more detail, see 40 CFR Part 264 and 265.

- Underground Injection Control (UIC) Program

Under the UIC regulations, RCRA hazardous wastes may be injected into Class I permitted wells. In some cases, hazardous liquids, such as extracted ground water from pump and treat operations, may be injected into a Class IV

UIC well. For example, ground water contaminated with RCRA hazardous wastes may be injected into Class IV permitted wells if it is part of a CERCLA response action or a RCRA corrective action and if it has been treated to 'substantially reduce hazardous constituents prior to such injection...' (RCRA § 3020(b)). (See Applicability of Land Disposal Restrictions to RCRA and CERCLA Ground Water Treatment Reinjection OSWER Directive #9234,1-06, December 1989.)

- Non-RCRA Hazardous Wastes

Some non-RCRA hazardous waste may be subject to management requirements under Subtitle D of RCRA as solid wastes. Subtitle D regulates disposal of solid waste in facilities such as municipal landfills. Therefore, non-RCRA hazardous IDW, such as decontaminated PPE or equipment, may need to be disposed of in a Subtitle D facility (depending on State requirements).

Clean Water Act (CWA). Discharges of aqueous IDW to surface water and publicly owned treatment works (POTWs) may be required to comply with CWA Federal, State, and local requirements. Requirements to be met may include water quality criteria, pre-treatment standards, State water quality standards, and NPDES permit conditions. Direct discharges to on-site waters are subject only to substantive requirements, while discharges to POTWs and other off-site discharges must comply with both a substantive and administrative CWA requirements (including Permitting requirements). (See Guide to Discharging CERCLA Aqueous Wastes to POTWs, June 1991 and CERCLA Compliance with the CWA and SDWA, #9234.2-06FS, January 1991.)

Toxic Substances Control Act (TSCA). If IDW contains PCBs, TSCA treatment and/or disposal requirements may apply during its management. TSCA requirements regulate the disposal of material contaminated with PCBs at concentrations of 50 ppm or greater as found on site (i.e., based on sample analysis and not the PCB concentration of the source material {e.g., transformer fluid}). (See PCB Guidance Manual, EPA/540/G-90/007, August 1990.) In addition, TSCA storage requirements may apply that limit the time that PCBs may be stored to one year. Furthermore, if PCB materials are mixed with a RCRA hazardous waste, they may be regulated by the LDR California list prohibitions. (See RCRA sections 3004(d)(2)(D) and (E).)

Department of Transportation (DOT) requirements. Where IDW will be disposed of off site or transported on public roads to a site, DOT requirements for containerizing, labeling, and transporting hazardous materials and substances may apply.

State requirements. Promulgated State regulations that are legally enforceable, timely identified, and more stringent than Federal regulations may be potential ARARs for IDW managed on site. Substantive requirements of State law that may be ARARs for IDW management include State water quality standards, direct discharge limits and RCRA requirements (including underground injection control regulations) promulgated in a State with an authorized RCRA hazardous waste management program (as well as programs authorized by State laws). Off-site, substantive and administrative requirements of State law may apply.

Off-Site Policy. In addition to complying with requirements of Federal and State laws all off-site disposal of wastes must comply with CERCLA section 121(d)(3) and the CERCLA Off-Site Policy (OSWER Directive No.9834.11 (November 13, 1987)). The Off-Site Policy establishes criteria for selecting an appropriate treatment, storage, or disposal facility (TSDF), including release criteria for all facilities that receive wastes from CERCLA authorized or funded response actions. In addition, receiving facilities must be in compliance with all "applicable laws."

Before shipping wastes off site, approval should be obtained for the proposed disposal facility from EPA's Regional Off-Site Policy Coordinator. In addition, EPA has adopted a policy for Superfund wastes shipped out of State that written notification should be provided to receiving States (OSWER Directive 9330.2-07, September 14, 1989).

GENERAL OBJECTIVES FOR IDW MANAGEMENT

In addition to the two requirements of protectiveness and compliance with ARARs to the extent practicable (on site) or compliance with applicable law (off site), EPA has identified two general objectives that Superfund site managers should consider when managing IDW: (1) minimization of IDW generation; and (2) management of IDW consistent with the final remedy for the site. The extent to which these objectives can be achieved is highly dependent on site-specific circumstances.

IDW Minimization

Site managers should strive to minimize the generation of IDW to reduce the need for special storage or disposal requirements that may result in substantial additional costs yet provide little or no reduction in site risks relative to the final remedial action. Generation of IDW can be minimized through proper planning of all remedial activities that may generate IDW, as well as through use of screening information from the site inspection. The potential problems of managing IDW should be a factor in choosing an investigative method. Site managers may wish to consider techniques such as replacing solvent-based cleaners with aqueous based cleaners for decontamination of equipment,

reuse of equipment (where it can be decontaminated), limitation of traffic between clean and hot zones and drilling methods and sampling techniques that generate little waste. Examples of such techniques include using gridding techniques to minimize the number of test pits or using soil boring instead of test pits. Alternative drilling and subsurface sampling methods may include the use of small diameter boreholes, as well as borehole testing methods such as a core penetrometer instead of coring. Site managers should also be careful to keep hazardous wastes separate from nonhazardous wastes.

Management Consistent with Final Remedy

Most IDW (with the exception of non-indigenous IDW) generated during the course of an investigation are intrinsic elements of the site. If possible, IDW should be considered part of the site and should be managed with other wastes from the site, consistent with the final remedy. This will avoid the need for separate treatment and/or disposal arrangements.

Because early planning for IDW management can prevent unnecessary costs and the use of treatment or disposal capacity, IDW management should be considered as early as possible during the remedial process. A key decision to be made is whether the waste will best be treated/disposed of immediately or addressed with the final remedy. If addressed with the final remedy, IDW volumes should be considered in the FS. In addition, when IDW is stored on site, it should be managed as part of the first remedial action/operable unit that addresses the affected media.

SELECTION OF IDW DISPOSAL OPTIONS

The following sections present the Agency's presumptions for IDW management that have been established based on the above considerations. The actual option selected should be based upon best professional judgment and should take into account the following factors:

- The type and quantity of IDW generated (sludge/soil, aqueous liquid, non-indigenous IDW);
- Risk posed by managing the IDW on site (e.g., based on site access controls, contaminant concentrations);
- Compliance with ARARs, to the extent practicable (on site);
- IDW minimization; and
- Whether the final remedy is anticipated to be an off-site or on-site remedy (or this information is unknown) and whether IDW can be managed consistent with the final remedy.

Off-site Final Remedies

If a site manager believes that the final remedy will involve off-site disposal of wastes, EPA's presumption is to manage the IDW as part of the remedial action addressing the waste/medium. Thus, until the final action, the IDW may be stored (e.g., drummed, covered waste pile) or returned to its source. However, the management option selected should also take into account any protectiveness concerns, ARARs, and other relevant site-specific factors (e.g., weather, storage space, and public concern/perceptions).

There are several potential reasons why it may be advisable to store IDW until the final action. First, because wastes at the site will be shipped off site eventually, returning IDW (especially sludges and soil) to its source would require that it be excavated again. Thus, site managers may consider it practical to containerize IDW as soon as it is generated. Second, storing IDW in containers may be more protective than returning it to its source. Third, because off-site actions may trigger such requirements as the LDRs, temporary storage will eliminate the need to meet these additional requirements until the final remedy.

In some cases, circumstances may lead site managers to choose to return the IDW to its source. This may be appropriate if it is determined that returning IDW to the source is protective and that storage at the site is not possible or practicable (i.e., given State or community concerns). In other cases, long-term storage may not be protective, and immediate off-site disposal may be a better option.

Example: A site involves volatile organic RCRA hazardous wastes that will likely be sent off site for final treatment and disposal. Site conditions are such that temporary storage of IDW is considered protective until the remedial action begins. Because off-site disposal will trigger RCRA disposal requirements such as the LDRs and immediate containerization would be more protective than redepositing into the source area at the time of sampling, the site manager decides to containerize the IDW (and comply with RCRA substantive technical tank and container standards) until the final action is initiated.

On-site Final Remedies (or Final Management in an Unknown Location)

When final management of wastes is likely to occur on site, the management presumptions vary depending on the type of IDW produced.

Sludge/soil

Generally, the Agency expects sludge or soil IDW will be returned to its source if short-term protectiveness is not an issue. The reason behind this presumption is that IDW that may pose a risk to human health and the environment in the long term will be addressed by the final action. Storage of RCRA hazardous IDW in container-s within the AOC prior to returning it to the source will not trigger the LDRs as long as the containers are not managed in such a way as to constitute a RCRA storage unit as defined in 40 CFR 260.10. Therefore, it may be possible to store IDW temporarily before redispersing of it. However, EPA believes that, in many cases, returning sludges and soils to their source immediately will be protective and will avoid potentially increased costs and requirements associated with storage. Site-specific decisions on how to manage sludge and soil IDW may ultimately vary from the presumption based on protectiveness, ARARs, and/or community concerns.

Example 1: The soil at a site contains wastes that are expected to be stabilized on site during the final remedial action. The site manager determines that sending soil IDW off site is not cost-effective, because off-site disposal would involve testing and transport costs for a relatively small amount of waste. Instead, knowing that the site is secure and that redispersing the waste at the source will not increase site risk or violate ARARs, the site manager decides to return soil IDW to the source area from which it originated.

Example 2: A site manager determines that returning highly contaminated PCB wastes to the ground at a site is not protective because of the potential risks associated with the material; instead, the site manager chooses to drum the waste and send it off site (in compliance with TSCA). (Off-site disposal may occur immediately or at a later date.)

Example 3: Soil IDW contaminated with a RCRA hazardous waste is generated from a soil boring. The site manager decides to put the IDW back into the borehole immediately after generation, but ensures that site risks will not be increased (e.g., the contaminated soil will not be replaced at a greater depth than where it was originally so that it will not contaminate "clean" areas) and that the contamination will be addressed in the final remedy.

Aqueous liquids

EPA has not established a presumption for the management of aqueous liquid IDW (e.g., ground water). Site managers should determine the most appropriate disposal option for aqueous liquids on a site-specific basis. Parameters to consider, especially in making the protectiveness decision, include the volume of IDW, the contaminants present in the ground water, the presence of contaminants in the soil at the site, whether the ground or surface water is a drinking water supply, and whether the ground-water plume is contained or moving. Special disposal/handling may be needed for drilling fluids because they may contain significant solid components. Examples of aqueous liquid management decisions considering these factors are presented in the following box.

Example 1: A site manager has large volumes of ground water IDW and does not know if it is contaminated. Pouring this IDW on the ground would not be protective, because it may contaminate previously uncontaminated soil or may mobilize contaminants that are present in the soil. Therefore, the site manager stores the water in a mobile tank until a determination is made as to whether the water and soil are contaminated or until the final action.

Example 2: IDW is generated from the sampling of background, upgradient wells. Because there are no community concerns or evidence of any soil contamination from other sources, the site manager decides to pour this presumably uncontaminated IDW on the ground around the well.

Example 3: Purge water from a deep aquifer is known to be contaminated with a RCRA hazardous waste. At this site, if this water were poured on the ground, it could contaminate a previously uncontaminated shallow aquifer that is a potential drinking water source and would have to comply with the LDRs. The site manager decides to containerize the water within the AOC and store it until the final remedy.

Non-indigenous IDW

Non-indigenous IDW (e.g., sampling materials, disposable PPE, decontamination fluids) should be stored until the final remedy or disposed of immediately. If contaminated, such waste may not be disposed of onto the ground because such an action would add contamination that was not present when activities began at the site (e.g., solvents used for decontamination). If non-indigenous IDW is contaminated with RCRA hazardous waste, it must be managed in accordance with RCRA Subtitle C requirements. Otherwise, site managers may generally dispose of it in an on-site dumpster (for PPE).

Example 1: Disposable PPE (e.g., gloves, shoe covers) becomes contaminated with RCRA hazardous waste during the field investigation. The site manager containerizes and disposes of this IDW in compliance with RCRA Subtitle C requirements.

Example 2: Disposable equipment becomes contaminated during a field investigation. The site manager decontaminates them and sends them to a Subtitle D facility.

COMMUNITY CONCERNS

Residents of communities near a CERCLA site, local governments or States may have concerns about certain disposal methods or long-term storage of IDW at the site. As with all CERCLA activities, site managers should evaluate community concerns regarding disposal of IDW in deciding what action to take. For example, if a community is concerned about the direct discharge of IDW water to surface water on site, site managers may want to consider sending the water to a POTW, if one is located nearby. In some instances, it may be appropriate to prepare fact sheets include options in other community relations documents or explain IDW management decisions at public meeting prior to actions.

NOTICE: The policies set out in this memorandum are not final agency action, but are intended solely a guidance. They are not intended, nor can they be relied upon, to create any rights enforceable by any party in litigation with the United States. EPA officials may decide to follow the guidance provided in this memorandum, or to act at variance with the guidance, based on an analysis of specific site circumstances. The Agency also reserves the right to change this guidance any time without public notice.

ATTACHMENT 2

SAMPLING AND TESTING OF INVESTIGATIVE WASTES

During the installation of monitoring wells and soil borings the amount of waste material generated in the form of drilling fluids and soil cuttings should be minimized. Waste materials generated from these activities will require containerization and sampling in order to determine proper disposal or treatment options. The following is a discussion of ways to not only minimize the amount of materials accumulated and thereby minimize the number of samples which have to be collected and analyzed, but also how to sample these wastes in order to best obtain representative results.

An attempt should be made to identify the exact depth within the formation where the soil cuttings originated or, in the case of drilling fluids, were in contact with the formation, if possible. When borings are extended into or below the water table it is advisable to segregate materials from a point approximately 10 feet above the top of the water table from those collected below the water table. In that way you can potentially minimize the amount of materials which may need to be sampled and characterized because they were in contact with contaminated groundwater.

When drilling off-site, or away from the area where a release occurred, an assumption can be made that soils above the water table do not contain contaminants, and therefore do not need to be containerized or sampled. This may not be true in those situations where soil gas migration may have carried contaminants off-site to adjacent properties. Field screening equipment, such as an OVM or PID, can be used to help isolate contaminated materials from 'clean' soils and cuttings for the contaminants in question, when appropriate.

Materials collected as the result of drilling or soil boring activities which require containerization should be collected and stored in 55 gallon drums, roll-off containers, or similar containers which can be closed or covered watertight and are compatible with the wastes being stored in them. These drums or containers should be marked such that they can be clearly identified as to the exact location and depths the materials came from. These drums or containers should also be stored in a secured location, if possible, and labeled as special waste materials until an exact determination can be made.

If soil samples are being analyzed from a soil boring or well location, the results from those analyses must be directly tied back to the material collected and the container it was placed in. In certain cases, you may be analyzing specific samples based upon elevated readings from field screening devices. This is why very precise labeling and identification of containers is necessary. Should the samples be too widely distributed or should you be unable to field screen for elevated readings, such as with pesticide contamination, all samples will need to be analyzed for the contaminants of concern.

Samples should be taken such that they are representative of the waste material to be analyzed. For material stored in 55 gallon drums, if field readings do not detect a hot spot or area from the boring, a representative sample should be collected for every 5-55 gallon drums or portion thereof. This sample should be a discrete sample taken from approximately the middle of one of the 5 drums. If the drum contains both liquid and solid fractions, these should be sampled and analyzed separately. This assumes that soil formations for the material collected in the 5 drums are consistent in their unified soil classification system (USCS) rating and there was no visual or other indications of contamination present. Where visual observations or field readings detect elevated readings, the sample should be collected from that depth or from the container where those specific materials were placed. Standard sampling methods and procedures should be followed to ensure that the results are representative of the materials in question.

If materials are being stored in a large container, such as a covered rolloff, a minimum of two samples should be collected from opposite ends of the soil pile. Two additional samples should be collected for every additional 100 cubic yards of material being collected and stored. These should be discrete samples and should be taken from at least 18 inches below the surface of the soil pile. An attempt should be made to identify those areas of a soil pile which may contain elevated concentrations or hot spots and these areas should be segregated out and sampled individually.

Liquids collected as part of well installation or development should be segregated from soils as much as possible. If the area is served by a sanitary sewerage system, permission should be obtained from its operator as well as the local District wastewater engineer for permission to directly discharge these liquids into that system. In most cases an analysis of the liquids will be required by the sewage treatment plant if information is not available on what contaminants are present.

All analyses should be performed using a method listed in EPA SW-846 designed to detect the target compounds. The method chosen should be one which gives an acceptable detection limit and will allow for characterization of the materials as hazardous or non-hazardous waste. Based upon these results, a determination will need to be made as to proper disposal or treatment options.

ATTACHMENT 3

LONG-TERM ON-SITE STORAGE OF INVESTIGATIVE WASTES (IW)

General

Storage of IW should be in above ground tanks or containers. Examples of tanks include large metal or fiberglass tanks and trailer tanks for hauling liquids on roads. Examples of containers are 55-gallon drums, rolloff boxes (also called "luggers") and U. S. DOT approved boxes for solids. Storage should not be in underground tanks, in-ground pits, surface impoundments, trenches or lagoons. The tanks or containers should be water tight and compatible with the IW being stored. Permanent labels that indicate the source of the wastes and their descriptions should be attached to all containers.

Containers or tanks should be stored in area with limited access, such as a fenced area or a building. If vandalism is a potential concern, consideration should be given to storing the IW in a building. Temporary buildings can be constructed for this purpose. For liquids, and especially highly contaminated liquids, consideration should be given to providing secondary containment for spills and leaks in accordance with the hazardous waste regulations (see below). For outdoor secondary containment, precipitation run on and run off control should be provided in accordance with those regulations.

Stored IW should be periodically inspected, with records kept. Deteriorating containers or tanks should be immediately replaced. Deteriorating 55-gallon drums can be overpacked. If a container label has deteriorated, it should also be replaced.

Hazardous IW Storage

Storage of hazardous IW should be in accordance with the Hazardous Waste Program regulation technical standards. The standards for containers are outlined in ss. NR 640.08 - 640.15. The standards for tanks are outlined in ss. NR 645.08 - 645.15.